MAN!

"Man is the measure-ment of everything."

If There Is Anything That Cannot Bear Free Thought—Let It Crack—WENDELL PHILLIPS

Vol. 6—No. 4. 1 (393) | Los Angeles, Calif., April 1938 | Administration and Editorial Address P. O. Box 971, Los Angeles, Calif. | Single Copies FIVE CENTS

INTERNATIONAL BRIGANDS LEAD THE WORLD

The world stood aghast when right after the outbreak of the revolution in Spain, Hitler and Mussolini recognized the Moorish hordes, led by Franco and his reactionary henchmen, as the legitimate government of that country. It then left no doubt in everyone's mind that such purported recognition by the two Fascist dictators meant they will supply Franco with all the needed men and material for his warring campaign so he should come out victorious over the Spanish republic.

The wiseacres, that is, those clever people who think they can play the political game with their eyes shut, immediately went into a huddle and almost unanimously decided it was the best thing that could have happened to the stricken Spanish republic. The reason? Well, it was just as plain as day. . . . England, they argued, cannot allow Fascist Italy to get a foothold in the Spanish peninsula where she might become a serious threat at Gibraltar—and might even go so far as to invade the Mediterranian sea, which by tradition as well as naval supremacy had been under control of His Majesty's fleet.

France, too, would on the one hand be threatened by a Fascist Spain on her Southern border, and on the other, a strengthened Germany would greatly increase her fear of being attacked from the North.

It was quite evident from these indispensable arguments that England, France and possibly Russia—who for ideological reasons must disapprove of a Fascist victory—will at once mobilize their armed forces for a march into Spain to ward off the two Fascist dictators and thus eliminate them as a growing threat to their own existence.

From all appearances it did not work out so well for the clever wiseacres. . . . England not only did not march into Spain but waited with "watchful-eye," hoping at the same time for an eventual Franco victory so that her Tory capitalists, having large investments there, will be more secure with their property as they would in the case of a victorious left-wing government. Even the deliberate bombings of her ships by rebel planes did not prompt her to take any strong measures against the rebel command save going through with the usual diplomatic formalities of protesting. And, when Franco's Moors and Italians finally conquered Asturia, she immediately opened negotiations with the Generallissimo for buying up the Ore from the Asturian mines and both sides now have representatives to supervise their inter-commercial relations.

What France did to satisfy the prophesies of those wiseacres is already known to all concerned. Right at the outset of hostilities in Spain she invented that famous nonexistent "non-intervention plan," which permitted men and munitions to flow to the insurgents and none to the loyalists. It is true that upon occasion France does jump up and threatens to open her border, which would give loyalist Spain an even chance to transport much-needed war material, but those outbursts have proven to be mere gestures in order, apparently, to pacify a protesting voice coming from time to time from a radical group at the great injustice being committed on the legitimate government of Spain. In the main her interest in the conflict is identical with that of any other imperialistic government that, for commercial purposes, seeks friendly relations with whichever government sets herself into power.

And Soviet Union! How much help did she offer Spain, supposedly her closest ally, from the viewpoint of communistic tendencies? For a time, there did appear some of her tanks and airplanes on Spain's battlefield; but that was only when republican Spain showed symptoms of Stalinine leanage. Just as soon as the Spanish workers rebelled against being dominated by the Communist party, Russia forthwith withdrew the meagre help she had previously contributed (not gratis, to be sure) and left Spain to her own fate. Furthermore, it isn't improbable that in event of a Rebel victory Soviet Union will negotiate a treaty with the Fascist junta. If she could have business and diplomatic relations with such class enemies as Hitler and Mussolini, there is no reason in the world why she shouldn't have similar dealings with Franco.

In the meantime, while all this political buccaneering is going on, two million of the Spanish people have already been exterminated and the whole working class of that country is threatened to be wiped out by mass slaughter of Franco's marauding bands.

Turning now to the other side of the map, we come face to face with an almost similar situation. As was the case with Spain, those same political chess-board strategists blinked significantly at one another when Japan invaded North and South China. Here they were firmly convinced that England, France, Russia and possibly the United States wouldn't hesitate a split second to jump on Nippon's throat. The logic for entertaining such belief was quite simple: all these great Powers have large interests in China, which offer them an opportunity to exploit her land for their own commercial markets; consequently, in order to preserve their commercial privileges, they could not permit Japan to enchroach on their territorial concessions by gaining control over the markets with a military conquest.

At the outbreak of hostilities things began to look favorably in that direction. Protests, notes, verbal barrages, and even diplomatic threats began to pour on the Japanese government from all sides. At times it even looked an open break is inevitable—that was when a British ambassador was machine-gunned by Japanese soldiers and an American vessel, the Panay, was deliberately bombed and sunk. Then, of a sudden, all became quiet on the East-Western front. . . . No incidents of any kind are now happening that should cause a breach between Japan and the outside world. Everything appears now to be just hunky-dory. Japan pursues her ruthless aggression, slaughters innocent noncombatants by the tens of thousands, annexes with cannon and sword province after province—with not even a whisper coming from any of the countries that have large investments in China. In fact, the whole press, the mouthpiece of these governments, suddenly changed its front-page hostility toward Japan and opened a widespread campaign of malicious propaganda against the Chinese defenders, branding them as guerillas, bandits, "anarchists"—in their villifying interpretation—so as to create a more favorable attitude for Japanese imperialism. Why? Why this sudden change of heart? Well, in order to find a suitable answer we must learn something about the way gangsters settle their differences. Here is how it's done: whenever there comes an argument in a gang about an unfair division of a loot, so much so that guns are drawn to compel a more equal distribution, the leader usually throws in some extra "dough" to the tougher members of the gang and all is hushed up; the smaller fry must then take what's left—or go for a ride. . . . That's just what has taken place in the China-Japanese situation. Japan hoodwinked the more powerful governments into a fair share of the spoils she will have eventually reaped in China and all is hushed up in the diplomatic cabinets; not a single protest is forthcoming now from any of them. The smaller fry, of course, never had much to say anyway.

And meanwhile, millions of Chinese are being slaughtered daily by a ruthless marrauding band of greedy imperialists.

Again the world received a terrific shoek. This time it was Hitler's raping of little Austria. It is the most contemptous, the most brutal and most provoking piece of brigandry the world has ever seen committed by one country upon another. But here, too, Austria will become the "loot" grabbed by a Nazi gangster, with the rest of the Powers waiting (as yet) for an equal share of the spoils. Already, and probably as a prearranged plan of the hold-up, British diplomats sit at green tables with the chief gang leaders of Europe—Hitler and Mussolini—discussing ways and means of how to settle their differences in this new crisis. What the outcome of these conferences may be can very well be predicted: Italy will be given recognition of Ethiopia, as well as domination of subdued Spain; Germany will be granted supervision over Austria—with Czechoslovakia and a few other of the Central-European states thrown in the bargain. England, as her share, will then have a free hand to kill off the Arabs and persecute India. France will, no doubt, be satisfied with the breathing-spell that allows her to retain, temporarily at least, the adopted provinces Alsace-Lorraine. Russia, too, will be pleased that she has been left alone so she could freely go about shooting off her anti-Stalinites.

International brigandry is on the rampage. A band of racketeers has grabbed a world by the throat, robbing it of all rights and privileges to live as human beings.

The moral of it all is this: As the world looks today, it is only fit for morons and imbeciles. There is no room left for humans with thinking minds. If, therefore, the more intelligent wish to preserve their human status and live as rational beings, they must voice their strongest protest against this un-social barbarism that has overtaken the human race. They must arouse the masses to revolt against international banditry that's leading mankind to death and destruction. And if ever the time shall come when the great masses will shake themselves loose from these ruling gangsters and organize a society based on principles of inter-human relation —only then will the world become a fitting place for all to live in.

Samuel Polinow

Judge and Law*

Through the public power the magistrate gains the right to pass judgment upon his fellowmen. This is a social aberration.

Indeed, to judge fairly and impartially the magistrate himself would have to go through the different states of soul encountered by the accused and define as well as point out the various outside influences which made him act as he did. The judge would have to possess the faculty to be able to escape from his own personality, forget his domestic life, own opinions, tastes, friendship, and above all his rancors.

Now, due to anxiety, worry, and what not, the delinquent often has tired, and sinister features; while the judge, a personality, has a calm and in most cases a flourishing face; property owner, he lives in an up-to-date apartment and enjoys the best wished for comfort.

And then some simple minded people ask themselves why truth is not the same everywhere and what is the reason for the several ways of understanding and rendering of justice.

Well I hold fast to the belief that under the mask of a judge truth is a very weak light, and a light that often is blown out, and that what is called justice by them does not and cannot exist.

"But why?" For the reason that the justice of men who arrogate to themselves the right to govern others places its claim upon law, while logically law ought to inspire justice.

Here a remarkable fact is that judges never inflict punishment in the name of this fictitious "justice" because the idea of this justice does not grant that right. Surely society has not the right to raise as a whole in order to do away with any one of its revolted members; and still less so for the reason that the latter is often himself a victim of this evil organized society; his crime, if any, has been brewed and stirred up; so much so that some exceptional judges have understood and excused it. The thing to do is to find out the cause and then prevent its effects. Do not penalize the motivated offense (sometimes caused through a mental desequilibrium) by a stipulated collective crime which, discussed and sanctioned is much more fearful, terrible and cowardly than the one in question.

Again there are plenty of judges who know the worthlessness of that justice and will never call upon it to justify their RAISON D'ETRE. They simply are tools of authority functioning as deft automatons; pressed by evidence they sometimes will complain that they act as compelled to. Even in some pitiful case where generosity is their counsellor, they tell you, "What do you want? We apply the law! That's all! DURA LEX, SED LEX!" And some of them add, "We know very well that the law is hard and specially absurd, but Congress is above us and they are there to modify, and if need be, abrogate it. We repeat we apply the law! That's all!"

That is their sacred justice! It oppresses the idealist, the poor devil and it slides down off the backs of limy big people and lowdown speculators.

Consequently I declare myself to be an enemy of the law for the reason that it is the work of a minority of individuals who only wish to rule the totality; also because law is always twisted to suit the interests of the powerful and above all I oppose the law for the reason that it is restrictive of all freedom.

Maurice Imbard

(Translated from "l'en dehors," by J. S.)

*With no apologies to Judge Leon R. Yankwich, this essay is being presented to the English speaking readers. —EDITOR.

"WE SHOULD LIKE THE WHOLE WORLD TO HEAR..."

A Statement of The Madrid Bar Association

The horrors and cruelties perpetrated by the military forces who are fighting the Spanish people with arms given them by the latter for their own defense, place the Bar Association in the imperious compulsion of protesting to the civilized world against the bloodiest and ferocious violation of humanity's elementary rights.

We all know that civil wars break the brotherly ties and bring about wild passion and hatred; but in Spain the rebels' deeds have surpassed all horrors of any collective criminality.

Since human solidarity is universal, we, as lawyers, hope that our clamor will bring some help from among our world-wide colleagues and from the masses of the highly civilized countries. Our voices, as opponents of Fascism and as faithful believers in democratic ideology, must reach the sensible and cultured people who hold fast to the fundamental principles of human dignity.

Here, the original character of public reaction in Spain must be studied in order to clarify the universal opinion influenced by political and other false classifications. Spanish Fascism is not the Italian and not the German Fascism. This remark does not imply that we do not oppose them all, one as well as the other. It must be stated that Spain faces a military uprising that stands for the defense of the old privileges and for the most archaic inquisitorial fanaticism. Through desperate efforts, the Fascists are trying to retard the natural progress and stop Spain from becoming a modern country.

In the past the Monarchy has governed Spain as if it were a colony. To-day Spain is fighting foreign troops for its liberation as the American colonies did more than a century ago to gain their national independence. And so we ask the protection of the world against this wave of ancestral barbarism.

Barbarism? The printed instructions found upon some Fascist officers that were taken prisoners, demand extermination and terror; they read: "Not only kill the higher ups and members of labor syndicates, but kill their families as well. We must spread such terror that all ideas of defense shall be entirely annihilated."

It would be impossible for us to bring to light the collective crimes against which we appeal to the international opinion; we shall only mention a few:

In the territories occupied by the Fascists all workers found in possession of a syndicalist card were shot and left in the streets in sinister heaps with their labor cards fastened on their arms or legs to show the motive for the execution.

Upon entering Badajoz the Fascist forces drove 1,500 workers to the Plaza de Toros, and with machine guns placed upon the rusticated steps, killed them all. The screams of the wounded workers were in vain, they died in terrible agony.

Jose Andres Manso, Salamanca Deputy and well known socialist lawyer, was also driven to the same Plaza where he was subjected to the "Banderillas" tortured and finally pierced to death by a sword.

In Constantina, Carmona, Losada, Palma de Rio, Penaflor, Alanis, Cazalla, Puebla and other Andalusian villages, aeroplanes bombed the peaceful populations though there was no military resistance on their part. Women and children lined in front of bakeries were the murderers' targets.

In Algeciras the rebels poured castor oil mixed with coal oil into the throats of pregnant women who then died in undescribable agony from the effects of the mixture.

In every province taken by the rebels all the Left Deputies and notorious officials were shot. Among them was Luis Rufilanchas, a lawyer of great celebrity and pupil of the famous professor Jiminez de Asua, Ladrove Cortes, a Deputy and elite lawyer, and his father; according to the Fascists both had refused to call at their office as requested. Don Basilio Gurrea, major of Lagrano; Perez Carballo, major of Coruna, and his wife, both highly cultured people and members of the Librarian Archivists' Association; the three Deputies Martinez de Nicolas, Dorado, and Antonio Acune; and Alonzo Zapata, director of the Madrid Scholar Group, his wife and children. The rebels proved their hatred for all culture.

In the village of Carpio, near Cordua, the Fascist captain led two hundred workers into the cemetary, compelled them to dig an immense grave, had them shot, and then notified the population, by the beating of drums, that two hours would be granted in which they could see their dead ones and pick up their belongings. WHEN THE FAMILIES WERE IN THE CEMETARY THE CAPTAIN ORDERED THEM SHOT. It would be impossible to describe the pathetic scenes of suffering.

In Moron, Sevilla, our forces, after reconquering the village, found women whose breasts had been cut off. Upon some of the village's walls the following ignoble inscription could be read: "We shall die, but your wives will give birth to Fascists."

In Caspe, Aragon, captain Negrete shot to death major Latorre, his wife and children, and Alezandra Blanco, a lawyer.

In Granada they assassinated that great writer, popular poet, genial and eminent dramatist, and most remarkable type of Spanish literary youth, Garcia Lorca.

In Baena, Cordua, according to the testimony of Antonio Moreno Benaventa, a socialist who made his escape, as soon as the Fascists became the village masters, they seized the list of the labor organizations, arrested all members, compelled them to dig their own graves and shot them in the presence of their families. Of 375 Syndicalists 296 were murdered. From the young people's socialist league,Gregorio Lonzo, Manuel Sevillano and Eduard Cortes were toed together and shot. Thirty workers were compelled to fortify the village's historical castle, and after working for 48 hours without rest or food they were thrown into the canal; three of them had lost their minds during the ordeal.

In El Carpio six F.A.I. militants were locked in their shed and burned to death. Raphael Garcia, secretary of the socialist group of Pedro Abad, Cordua, confirmed the fact that Fascists took seven workers in a truck, led them to the outskirts of the village, and burned them alive with kerosene.

In Saragossa alone, more than 4,000 workers were executed. Dr. Alcrudo was arrested and when he refused to denounce the whereabouts of his brother, he was asked, "Do you prefer to be shot first or to see your son killed?" He answered, "Shoot me first!" Then the Fascists went for the son, a student of 18 years, and when brought in front of the father they said to the latter: "Your request cannot be granted." They murdered the son and waited long enough to enjoy the father's agony before shooting him.

The Morrocan hordes do not even respect those who brought them to Spain. Upon entering Navalmoral, they assaulted and murdered Fascist religious women and girls who were then praying for the rebels' triumph.

Now, Fascist propaganda would make you believe that the republican government has persecuted the Catholic religion; this is absolutely untrue. Before the militarist insurrection, the Catholic creed was entirely respected, and it was so even after the uprising in the territory controlled by the loyalists. In the Basque provinces, where the clergy had not committed any hostile act against the government, there was no persecution, and the churches remained open for services. Where acts of violence were committed it was only because the priests had attacked the population with machine guns placed in the church towers. In Galicia there was even an entire regiment composed exclusively of priests and seminarians who specialized in executing workers.

It can be remarked that among prisoners made by the loyalists, the religious element is often found. On the other hand we see that the rebels give orders, by radio, to take away all precious objects from the churches and sell them for the benefit of their bloody cause. As for instance, they have taken the great treasures of the Pilar Virgin, in the Cathedral of Saragossa, and have sold them in London for 400 million pesetas.

In Pampelume they celebrated a procession during which an image of the Virgin was paraded, then they placed in the center of the public square, as an act o reverence to the Virgin and Christianism, 60 prisoners who were then executed as a part of the celebration.

In Granada, to prove their archaic fanaticism, the Fascists arrested all Free Masons, compelled them to dig their own graves, and then murdered them.

Yes, we should like the whole world to hear our voices, to perceive and take into consideration our appeal. Let us isolate the rebels as we isolate ferocious beasts, for they have no right to the sympathy of civilized men.

The Bar Association of Madrid appeals to the universal fraternity, and is sure that it will touch the deepest chord in the heart of the civilized world.

Eduardo Ortega y Gasset, President
Luis Zibillaga, Secretary

(*L'Espagne Nouvelle*)

Our Downfall

Why should we apply plasters of lies on the masses' wounds? The truth must be told. The international labor movement is a failure. The most shameful submersion and greatest disaster known in revolutionary history fell upon Germany in 1933; *and the routing still continues the world over, and will go on as long as the masses and the militants will despairingly hold fast to a system that has led them to the abyss. It will only stop when propagandists, ballot-box-runners, dues paying herds, and political party sympathizers will raise their heads and say to their chiefs: You lied to us! We shall now have the truth! Light, more light is our motto. As for you—you can all go to hell!*

And why? Read the papers of the past twenty years and every day you will see revolutionary victory reports given to the masses by those who were murdering the revolution day by day. You will be struck by the never ending electoral success of the Socialists and Communists; their constantly increasing memberships. . . . Shall we bring to your attention the purging and discipline that makes these parties unbreakable? Or shall we enumerate the repeated failures and bankruptcies of the parties?

Thus, to-day we are awaiting our turn to be thrown into jail for our meditation, or to become the playthings in a new world-war! The 50,000,000 *unemployed are peacefully awaiting the day when bullets and asphyxiating gas will rid them and their children of their worldly existence. And every day patented dope-pedlers, Socialists, and Communists feed us with lies.*

Indeed, the fact is that all your ballot-box victories and all your success as organizers have always been and always will be steps toward the general downfall. Your whole "tactics" and world "conception" are nothing but fallacies ripe for the dump pile.

Yes, through your policy the principle of authority has gained ground among the masses. You have sacrificed rebellious spirit to blind discipline. You have systematically corrupted level headed men and bureaucrats, made scoundrels and cowards out of them. You have based your cause upon "getting there," and double dealings. You have spread a hatred for individual courage, free thought and sectarianism.

But after all, you are nothing but priests and ministers. And if among you there are people of good faith, believers, and martyrs, your crime is the greater—for you are wasting humanity's most precious forces.

The best and only service you could render would be for you to get off the map and leave us in peace.

* * *

Now it is up to us to get out of the morass. The thing to do is to clear your brain of the trash you have accumulated; renew the traditions you have destroyed; search for the spontaneous and living source you have poisoned, place all questions under a true light, and mistrust everything that is similar to what we have discarded.

However, it must be said that the 1914 *generation has nothing to do with this work. They are worn out, their spontaneous reaction was only a miscarrying of barren Bolshevism. It will be too late for Freedom to prevail if the new generation undergoes Fascist training. To produce free men, and not "lectors" at the service of dictatorships, the intermediary generation must find the strength to break their chains, bury the past, destroy and, even if needed, be ready for their own destruction.*

. . . The historical role of Marxism, Bolshevism, Fascism and the capitalist rationalization bequeathed to us by the war generation, has been to brutally soak us with militarism, totalitarianism, social illusionism, and a sickening worship for chiefs, plans, and the State. Today the Russian Leninist Third International, a copy of the German Bismarkian Second International, has only one thing to do, and that is to cram itself with its rot! Reformism is but a decaying matter; State Capitalism in all its aspects, including Fascism, is our great enemy. The light of a new day comes to us from Spain.

A. Prudhommeaux

(*Terre Libre*)

TWO ASSASSINATIONS

The New Times & Ethiopia News of January 22, 1938, brings the following news story from the London Daily Express staff reporter at Paris:

The boasting of a conscript in the French Army barracks at Constantine, North Africa, led to the disclosure to-night of the men behind the most sensational political murder of the year.

Last June Professor Carlo Roselli, Italian anti-Fascist leader, bitterest foe of Mussolini, was found stabbed dead with his brother Nello Roselli, in a car at Couterne, in France.

Private Bouvier, of the Third Regiment of Chasseurs, hinted to his comrades that he knew something of the murder.

Police discovered Bouvier's name in lists of members of the Hooded Men, the revolutionary secret society of the Right. From this clue they tracked down the rest of the murder conspirators.

Bouvier on his own confession, was ordered by the Hooded Men to watch the Roselli brothers last spring.

On June 11th, he went on, the Rosellis were followed when they went motoring by another car containing four members of the Hooded Men. Bouvier himself, with two others, was in a third car. He said that he heard knocks coming from the cars ahead and "assumed that the Rosellis had been murdered."

A statement made by M. Max Dormoy, Minister of Interior this evening, said that the murderers numbered four in all. Three are known—Filliol, Jacubiez and Puireux. The police are searching for a fourth. Puireux was arrested this evening.

Filliol, who is said to have been an active member of the Hooded Men, has been in hiding for several months. He has not yet been found.

Jacubiez has been in prison since October 22nd. It was the arrest of Jacubiez last October which put the police on the track of the Hooded Men organization.

To-night he made a confession implicating his colleagues in the Roselli murders. This statement was taken as further proof that the Hooded Men received support from Italy because their movement was a counter to anti-Fascist influence in France.

Of the two men accused of being accomplices, Bouvier has been arrested and another, Fauran, is under interrogation.

Fauran is the son of a wealthy Paris family. He has a big American car.

PRESS DEFENDS FREEDOM OF THOUGHT

Comrade Marcus Graham

Presidents, ministers and radio-crooners change. But the system of intolerance and narrow-mindedness seemingly remains as it ever has been.

It is nearly 19 years that our labor department wants to exile from the country the editor of the anarcho-individualist* periodical "Man!". Nineteen years that comrade Graham undergoes ordeals. House searches are made upon him and his literary activities are systematically interfered with.

It is therefore not more than just, that all free-loving persons should mobilize to defend a comrade in need . . . funds are needed to carry on the fight for comrade Graham's liberation.

FREIE ARBEITER STIMME

* * *

Anarchy on Trial in U. S.

Anarchy on trial deals with the case of Marcus Graham, editor of "Man!" a monthly English Anarchist paper published, at present, in Los Angeles, California. The immigration authorities are harassing Graham with the expectation to silence a rebellious voice which, in spite of threats and all, remains firm and fearless.

They have brought out of its grave a Warrant of Deportation dating from Nov. 18, 1919; a Warrant which they had been unable to enforce for the reason that Canada, where Graham stated to be born, refused to accept him.

Graham was arrested for the first time in Paterson, N. J. in April, 1919, and detained in Ellis Island for some weeks. In Feb., 1921 he was again arrested in the Public Library of New York, taken to the "bomb squad chamber" where, as he continued to refuse furnishing more information in regard to his identity, was subjected to the third degree tortures in order to break his steady and immovable stand. In July, 1930, he was arrested anew in Yuma, Arizona, by a too zealous immigration inspector for having in his possession two copies of "An Anthology of Revolutionary Poetry" an extremely important volume edited by Graham; a book containing poems from 400 various writers of twenty different nationalities. In two weeks Marcus Graham got acquainted with the police of Yuma, El Centro, San Pedro, and Los Angeles, Calif.

Since the beginning of the publication of "Man!" five years ago means of all kinds have been tried to suppress this Anarchist voice that condemns authority with words of the highest simplicity and lucid clearness. They have tried with searches and with the arrest of Ferrero and Salitto, holding them several years under the threat of deportation in Italy. They have tried to scare its subscribers; and again, without any arrest warrant took Graham to jail in Oct., 1937. Later they released him under one thousand dollars bail. Rearrested in Jan., 1938, he was sentenced to six months' imprisonment for contempt of court.

Speaking in his defense before the sentence was pronounced, Graham denounced the filthy conspiracy warped against him and his professed ideas.

"Ordering me to answer and condemning me for my refusal to do so," said Graham, "the court will demonstrate the correctness of the position taken by the Anarchists who consider the government not as an administrative body that serves the people's interests, but an enemy of the said interests, not an organism of truth, but of lies, not of justice but of low injustice. . . . If it were not for my editing "Man!" I would not be facing imprisonment. But it is nevertheless a fact that "Man!" is published legally. It is accepted as a legal paper by the post office. . . . The district Attorney concluded dramatically that my chief crime is in being editor of "Man!" that expounds such an Anarchist society. With full pride I plead guilty of this charge. . . . My going to jail by order of a liberal court will fully substantiate the Anarchist contention in toto as to the basis for the founding, existence and perpetuation of government—the dispensing of injustice. I shall close with the words of the greatest of all Americans—Henry David Thoreau—when he said: 'Rather than love, than money, than fame, give me truth!' And I add —the word Freedom—the true essence of Anarchy."

* * *

The agitation and campaign against the deportation of Ferrero and Sallitto—of whom the "Risveglio's" readers were informed from time to time—has produced good results. If the cancellation of deportation is still pending in the former's case, it has been dropped in regard to Sallitto.

There is no doubt that various elements have been influenced and have taken a vivid interest as well as a definite position in this question of deportation, through the Committee's active work.

Legally Sallitto's case established the precedent of a cancellation of deportation by pressure of individual and collective protests. Indeed, four times the deportation ordered by the Department of Labor had been approved and endorsed by the ordinary courts as well as by the courts of appeal.

Congressman Celler has introduced a bill in the House which would grant the right of asylum to Ferrero. Thus the latter's case may still drag for several years.

Our two comrades could have lived in a way as to let their case drop in oblivion. But they have prefered to fight it in the open. For there was also a question of principle. Surely numerous are the workers, foreigners, or radicals who hide the facts of the infamies committed against them or who promptly disappear to avoid open persecution. Here, instead, the agitation has had the merit to create a precedent and to interest a circle of a million people in our two comrades' case. Moreover we may hope that also in the case of comrade Graham it will be settled without further persecution.

Redento.

"Il Risveglio," Geneva, Switzerland.

*MAN! has never called itself anything else but an Anarchist journal.—EDITOR.

The Proscribed

Beside the fact that our feelings of solidarity go to Graham, his case in itself is particularly interesting.

Indeed, it is probably the first time in the United States that the fifteenth century Bourbonic laws have been applied to a person whose identity is not clearly established. In every European country, where the Bourbonic police still exist, it is customary for them to arrest any individual, in Graham's situation, keep him in jail for a few weeks, prolong his incarceration, and stretch the case until they succeed in making a rag out of the persecuted or until they become tired of failing to clarify his identity.

But in America things are not done half-way; the federal Judge Leon R. Yankwich—known as a "Liberal," who renders justice in the name of a progressive and democratic government—has lengthened the few weeks of Bourbonic incarceration to six months by sentencing Graham for the crime of not being obliging enough to place Miss Perkin's watchdogs in a position where they could deport him to a country ready to accept him as a subject.

Yet, in the American Constitution we read the following article: "No person . . . shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself." Judge Yankwich, therefore, banishes Marcus Graham from his constitutional rights by compelling him to testify against himself.

Now, as Congress has violated the First Amendment in doing away with the freedom of thought, speech and association of foreigners, Judge Yankwich also takes it upon himself to annihilate constitutional guaranties.

Again, more antiquated than the Constitution is the law of civil jurisprudence which requires proof to be produced by the accuser. If Miss Perkin's inspectors are sure that Graham is a foreign Anarchist, subject to deportation, let them prove it and find the country that will accept him as one of its own. Why should the accused provide the federal police with facts for which they are paid to find? If they are not able to fulfill their trade let them get out; if they cannot prove that the hunted person can or may be deported, that is their business, and in view of these facts he should be freed.

Graham admits his Anarchist convictions, but he cannot be deported to Canada, where he affirms to be born, because that country refuses to accept him. Is Graham guilty because the Canadian government does not want him?

To condemn a man for an act so independent of his will is not only an injustice, but an infamy. And Judge Yankwich through his sentence that violates the Constitution, has succeeded in recalling the Bourbonic ignominy; he has lent his support to commit this infamy.

* * *

The reason given by Judge Yankwich of Los Angeles in sentencing Marcus Graham to six months imprisonment for contempt of Court is a sophism which demonstrates how judges can twist and interpret laws any way it suits their purpose.

Marcus Graham is accused of contempt of Court because he refused to obey the order of the Department of Labor to furnish them with data regarding his identity and nationality.

Judge Yankwich sustains that Marcus Graham is compelled to furnish this data, and to prove his opinion to be correct, the judge must jump over two extraordinary reefs, and he succeeded. But how?

The first reef is the immigration law. "This law," writes Mr. Wirin, Graham's lawyer, "is divided into two sections: one dealing with exclusion of aliens—the other, with deportation. There is no provision in the latter section for contempt proceedings; there is in the former. In order to send Graham to jail it was necessary for the judge to rule, as he did, that Congress had put provisions for contempt 'IN THE WRONG PLACE.' Having decided that the Congress of the United States had made a mistake, the Judge proceeded to rewrite the law for Congress. Thus Judge Yankwich not only 'INTERPRETED' the law; he, in effect, rewrote it."

The second reef is the Constitution. The Fifth Amendment of the Constitution guarantees against self-incrimination. No one can be compelled to testify against himself. Thus, according to this Amendment Marcus Graham cannot be forced by any Court to testify against himself anti still less can he be legally condemned for his refusal. Here Judge Yankwich gave his reason as follows: ". . . in view of the civil nature of the deportation proceedings under the immigration law, the guarantee of the Fifth and Sixth Amendments do not apply to them. No violation of the guarantee against self-incrimination is involved in compelling one, whose right to remain in the United States is challenged, to give testimony." And consequently, Judge Yankwich affirms that Marcus Graham is excluded from the protection of the Fifth Amendment for the reason that he has not the right to reside in the United States. In this way we see Judge Yankwich substituting himself for the government as he substituted himself for Congress.

Indeed, why does the authority of the Department of Labor compel Graham to answer questions? They do this in order to establish the fact that Graham has or has not the right to reside in the United States. And why does the authority turn to the Federal Judge Leon Yankwich of the Southern District of California to sentence Graham to jail in order to obtain an answer to their question? Because without Graham's answer they are unable to decide if he has or has not the right to reside in the United States. However, Judge Yankwich simply, by his own authority, makes the decision that Marcus Graham has not the right to reside in this country and excludes him from the jurisdiction of the Fifth Amendment.

Yankwich is known as a liberal Judge; but his decision in Graham's case shows him as a reactionary who, in the civil prescription only sees the "undesirable."

L'ADUNATA

* * *

Under Roosevelt's "New Deal"

Marcus Graham, editor of the Anarchist paper "Man!" and the author of "An Anthology of Revolutionary Poetry," was arrested in 1919 by the federal authorities to be deported to Canada. (Graham was born in Montreal.) When the Canadian government refused to accept him, claiming not to have any reason why they should do so, Graham was liberated after serving a few months in jail. After this detention he was rearrested in 1921, 1930 and 1937; always for the same cause. Graham had the opportunity to learn, at his own sacrifice, all about the American torture known as the third degree.

Graham is now free on $1,000 bail. For refusing to answer questions put to him by the federal judge, questions dealing with his nationality, he will be tried for contempt of court.

Since 1919 Marcus Graham has not violated any law of the land, but he is an Anarchist, and that is his crime. He seriously believed in the United States Constitution and its Freedom of the Press; then he followed his inclination to be an editor.

Now, we ask ourselves if "Man!" will be suppressed because of our indifference to this most important case involving the Freedom of the Press.

J. S.

"LE LIBERTAIRE," Paris, France

* * *

In Roosevelt's Country

The United States is an influential member of the democratic block; nevertheless this does not stop it from being one of the countries where the non-conformist press meets with the greatest difficulties on the part of authority.

This is particularly brought to light by the Marcus Graham case. M. Graham is the soul of a periodical publication "Man!" and the editor on "An Anthology of Revolutionary Poetry" on which he worked ten years. For the sixth time the United States government inquires about his real name, nationality and entry in the country. M. Graham has refused to answer, or better say Graham stated that he was born in Canada where during the war of 1914-1918 he raised his voice against conscription. Now Canada pretends not to find any trace of his birth. However Graham places himself at a point of view entirely different than these flimsy questions entail, in declaring that never having, in any country, taken part in the making of any kind of law, he refuses to recognize the right of a government, no matter what name it may bear, to address him questions concerning his personal life, political or other conceptions. Dragged before the court the public persecutor did not hesitate to declare pathetically that Graham's main crime consisted in the fact that he is the editor of "Man!." And yet the judge sent him to prison for six months—for contempt of court.

Let us call the attention of our readers to the fact that Graham, first arrested for deportation, passed six months in prison in New York. The government plan failed, not before placing Graham under the third degree tortures—that means that Graham went through the New York judiciary police chamber of spontaneous acknowledgment of guiltiness.

* * * "l'en dehors," France

Marcus Graham Arrested

On October 6, 1937, Marcus Graham, editor of MAN!, was arrested, searched and his home broken into without even the legal form of a warrant. After being brutally tormented by his jailors he is now out on bail awaiting further hearings. The many-year old campaign of the Federal authorities to deport Marcus Graham and to suppress this journal and thus drive a deep wedge into freedom of the press must be combatted with all our energy. If this fascistic treatment of Man! and its editor is allowed to pass, a firm foothold will be given to the capitalist reaction for further and wider attacks against elementary civil rights and liberties, the major victim of which will be militant organized labor.

VANGUARD

WE INVITE YOUR SUPPORT!

Everyone can aid us in carrying on the battle for bringing about a dismissal of the Deportation proceedings against Marcus Graham, and a stoppage of the persecution of MAN! by sending protests to the Secretary of Labor, Miss Francis Perkins, Washington, D. C., either as individuals or as organizations.

We need also your material support in order to be able in publicizing the case, by publishing the pamphlet "Defenders of Freedom of Thought Throughout the Ages", as also for the sending out of press releases and carrying on the appeal through the Circuit Court.

All correspondence and funds should be addressed to the:

MARCUS GRAHAM FREEDOM OF THE PRESS COMMITTEE
P. O. BOX 971, LOS ANGELES, CAL., U. S. A.

MAN!
A Monthly Journal of the Anarchist Ideal and Movement
MARCUS GRAHAM, Editor
Subscription Price: $1.00 per year, 6 months-50c
Sample Copies Free Upon Request.
MAN! invites the collaboration of all workers and artists who are in sympathy with our ideas to send us essays, prose, poems, and drawings. No payment can be made. Where return of manuscript is desired sufficient postage should be included.
Administration and Editorial Address
MAN!
P. O. Box 971
Los Angeles, Calif., U.S..A

IN RETROSPECT OF CURRENT EVENTS

"INTERNATIONAL ANARCHY"?

Who would have thought it possible that we should awaken one fine afternoon, turn on the radio, and then hear the declaration of a secretary of State, representing close to 130 million people, that the world is now being ruled by "international anarchy"?!

Yet, this is what happened last month when Mr. Hull, "our" secretary of State, made this statement. Did Mr. Hull by any chance mean to imply that the people of the world have at last discarded all the existing Governments, and as a consequence—the profit system could no longer function—and the reign of a non-rulership and non-exploiting system has set in everywhere?

You guessed it wrong. Mr. Hull did not mean to imply anything of the kind. He was just referring to the misdeeds perpetrated by the fascist and nazist gangsters that brought upon the world "international anarchy". Now, what Mr. Hull meant by "anarchy" is what every misrepresenter of the anarchist philosophy has always meant and so employed; whether such misrepresenters were reactionaries or liberals, socialists or communists, made little difference.

Any good dictionary would enlighten Mr. Hull as well as every traducer of the anarchist philosophy that what they mean by "anarchy" is exactly the state of disorder and chaos, suffering and need that prevails at present wherever Governments and Exploitation prevails—as much so in so-called democratic countries—as in fascist ridden ones.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S FAILURES

The anti-lynch bill has been talked to death with the chief aid of President Roosevelt's brethren democrats of the South. The Wage-hour bill—ditto. The re-organization bill met even a more disastrous defeat—for it involved the paring off of so many lucrative jobs. Thus, Mr. Roosevelt's patch-up program in order to save the profit system, still remains but a paper-wish.

Until of late President Roosevelt felt the knife that the U. S. Supreme Court was plunging into all his patch-save-the-profit-system proposals. Now it is his co-democratic Congressmen and Senators that are doing the job. One lucky thing it is nevertheless for Mr. Roosevelt: it gives him a clean bill of health, even if his proposals are far from being clean-cut remedies for the evils that prevail.

How many times need one point out that those who have repeatedly brought defeat to Mr. Roosevelt's proposals are receiving pay—as servants of the people? As such they have sworn to carry out the mandate entrusted to them by the electorate. And, as it has happened in the United States,, as well as wherever Government as such prevails, the "servants" of the people, once elected turn their backs upon those who have chosen them—for good pay, and spit them back in the face.

Politics is but a game. And where there are games played, foul means as well as dishonest ones, usually become part of the game. And the greatest game of all is the charlatanistic game called—politics. And as long as the people continue in paying homage to this game, of which they themselves are the chief suckers, the result will always be the same old story . . . . betrayal.

A DEMOCRATIC GOVERNOR SAVES JOBS FOR SAVIORS

Borough President of New York City, Mr. Stanley W. Isaacs, himself a republican had no sort of fear in appointing "comrade" Simon W. Gerson, star reporter of the "Daily Worker," as one of his secretaries. To judge by the commotion that followed one would have imagined that the city of New York, New York State, if not the entire country was foredoomed to utter destruction. At least that seemed to be the conviction of both legislatures in New York state. In reality it was but the sole fear that since the "communists" of yesterday have today become such practical "realists" as to turn into jingoistic patriots and supporters of the democratic administration, many a job might go to them as sort of "pay off". And did our "communists" squak! Thunder and hales! The country was to go down to destruction. But a kind-hearted democratic Governor Lehman saved both the country and the future job-hand-outs for the "saviour" party of the working class.

One might ask as to how the working class day of emancipation has been made nearer now that the "saviour" party leaders have been given the opportunity to sit at the public trough? We offer a free subscription to any one who can give an affirmative reply that would sound truthful.

QUESTIONABLE DEFENDERS OF FREEDOM

As country after country is being overtaken by the blackest scourge in modern history—fascism and nazism, leading officials of the U. S. Government are making efforts to appear as champions and defenders of Freedom of Thought and of its expression, via the Freedom of the Press.

Thus one witnesses how Governor Lehman vetoes a bill that would bar Communists from accepting lucrative jobs from republican or democratic high dignitaries on the ground of freedom—since the Communist party is a legally recognized party.

The U. S. Supreme Court hands down a decision in which it is said:

> The liberty of the press is not confined to newspapers and periodicals. It necessarily embraces pamphlets and leaflets. These indeed have been historic weapons in the defense of liberty, as the pamphlets of Thomas Paine and others in our history abundantly attest."

New York State holds a convention this month in order to revise its constitution and Chief Justice Crane of that state, as the opening speaker, states:

> We believe in the freedom of speech, and that no man, whoever he may be, should be punished or disciplined merely because of his views or opinions regarding the government.
>
> We believe in the freedom of the press. We may at times chafe under its criticisms and be annoyed when it becomes personal, but we know that it is one of the strongest safeguards we have against oppression and abuse.

Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, comes forward with an appeal-proposal to all democratic countries that they should offer asylum to all political refugees from fascist and nazi ridden countries.

To top everything, President Roosevelt comes forward on March 25, 1938 to assert that since 1789 the U. S. has been offering asylum to political exiles and that he intends to keep this country a haven for political refugees.

All this display by public officials in behalf of Freedom of Thought, as well as for those who give expression to it, has every appearance of being genuine— if it were only true. That is, if these very officials would translate into practice what they pretend to give lip-service to.

One need but lift the all too transparent veil that hides the truth in order to realize how far from sincere the officials are.

New York City, for instance, is now ruled by a supposedly "liberal" administration. Yet, at its head as Police Commissioner stands a creature named Valentine who "rose" from the ranks of the most infamous Third Degree Bomb Squad against radicals that any city in America has ever known. Mr. Valentine was a plain stool-pigeon and thug. That he has not changed at all is proven by the fact that he still upholds publicly the employing of the Third Degree as a concommittant of justice. In this he is being supported by Mayor LaGuardia. Has anybody then heard that Governor Lehman or Chief Justice Crane should call for the dismissal of this thug Third Degree Police Commissioner in the name of Justice and Freedom—that even those accused of crime are accorded by the U. S. Constitution?

The same august body—the U. S. Supreme Court that hands down a decision in which it assumes, as a matter of fact, that we have in this country freedom of the press has only but a short while ago turned down a request of the attorneys for Vincent Ferrero to review the order of his deportation to fascist Italy. Why did it refuse? Ferrero is accused of having published an anarchist publication in the Italian language and of aiding the publication of MAN! to come into being. By having granted a review on the Ferrero case—the contents of the two anarchist publications, excerpts from which form the main "evidence" for ordering Ferrero deported, the issue of the freedom of the press, in its true meaning, would have had to come forward as a real test of the U. S. Supreme Court Justices' readiness to uphold the "historic weapons in the defense of liberty" that they just now pretend to safeguard. How much respect can then any self respecting person retain for the high sounding assumption in behalf of Freedom of Thought that the U. S. Supreme Court has given on the issue of distributing a leaflet?

In approaching to test out in practice the wordy claims of President Roosevelt one need but take a good look at his own administration—the Labor Department—for instance.

Under this innocent sounding name of a Labor Department, we have seen for the last six years how scores upon scores of men and women were thrust into jails, finger printed and photographed as would be the worst sort of criminals. And who were these people? In every instance they were active participants of Labor's struggle for a more just and saner society. Workers were dragged from the picket lines in the General Strike of San Francisco, in the year of 1934, as well as from picket lines of every other important strike throughout the country. Speakers and editors of publications expounding a new social order were likewise marked out and pounced upon.

In face of these undeniable facts what value then can any sincere person attach to the statement of President Roosevelt about his desiring to continue having the United States serve as an asylum for political exiles? For, as long as he allows but a singular political deportation proceeding to stand, his position remains assailable. One cannot allow one's own administration to bend every effort in making political exiles out of sincere social idealists at home—and then expect any one to believe President Rosoevelt that he is sincere in pleading the cause of political exiles of other countries.

Whichever way one reads the record score, whether from the bottom up or from the top down, of Governor Lehman, Judge Crane or the U. S. Supreme Court, or of President Roosevelt and of his administration, all stand convicted as pretentious hypocrites as far as the true principles of freedom of expression, of the freedom of thought are concerned.

If any one is seeking to find a true cause as to why the Hitler and Mussolini gangsters are now marching on triumphantly with their designs in country after country, one will not have far to seek. It lies in the very empty platitudes of those who wield authoritative power in so-called democratic countries, as well as in the economic unjust system that prevails in these very lands.

Furthermore, no state servant can afford to act as a true defender of Freedom—spiritually or economically speaking. The very institution of the State was founded, exists and perpetuates itself for the essential purpose of maintaining economic injustice, the profit system. And where the profit system prevails no true Freedom of Thought can be tolerated.

The whole of humanity finds itself therefore today doomed at the hands of the democratic State as well as at the hands of the fascist or "communist" State. And for this horrible mess of affairs, it has no one else to blame as much as itself. It allows politicians to mislead them in participating in electing the very authorities that constitute every State, thereby placing itself in the identical position as would be the doomed to-be-hanged man who aids in preparing the noose that is to be tightened around his own neck.

The terrible toll in human life, destruction of every vestige of happiness as well as that of its prevention from coming into being, that mankind pays by allowing the twin monsters of exploitation and rulership to prevail—is as high in times of so-called peace as it is in war times. And war is but another form by which capitalism and the State perpetuate themselves.

Economic Freedom and the Freedom of Thought can only come into its own when man realizes the need of first liberating himself from every economic and political fetter that binds his soul and body today. Before this can take place the profit system as well as the State will both have to be discarded. Then only will humanity begin to enjoy the blessings that the materialization of true freedom in every sphere of life can bring to each living soul.

Marcus Graham

Book Review

"FREE SPEECH AND PLAIN LANGUAGE"
By Albert Jay Nock — Morrow & Co., 1937.

In these days of dictatorships and Moscow trials it is time to pay attention to free speech and to learn from the most scholarly American anarchist reasons for his emphasis upon the freedom and responsibility of the individual which is in great danger of being swallowed up by the State.

In this book of essays, as well as in other books which he has written, the author does not address himself to the masses, but to that Remnant to whom the ancient prophet Isaiah spoke. He states:

> "The Remnant are those who by force of intellect are able to apprehend these principles and by force of character are able, at least measurably, to cleave to them; the masses are those who are unable to do either."

Speaking of the message of the prophet the author sees him telling the truth and sparing no one knowing that it will not do much good to the masses. He states further:

> "The official class and their intelligentsia will turn up their noses at you, and the masses will not even listen. They will keep on in their own ways until they carry everything down to destruction,* and you will probably be lucky if you get out with your life. . . . The Remnant, . . . They need to be encouraged and braced up, because when everything has gone completely to the dogs, they are the ones who will come back and build up a new society, and meanwhile your preaching will reassure them and keep them hanging on. Your job is to take care of the Remnant."

To a minority group fighting against the stupidity, ignorance and greed of mankind these words give courage. Both Nock and C. E. S. Wood, the author of "Heavenly Discourse," and more recently "Earthly Discourse," are old men who have lived lives full of experience. They have ceased to desire to sway multitudes but they both appeal to those who do not need the applause of a multitude to form their ideas for them. It is such men as these who give hope to the human race.

Quoting Jefferson: "It is error alone which needs the support of government; truth can stand by itself," the author shows clearly that there has never been a time when government has not been given special privileges to the few; that in fact there never was a system of laissez-faire-in England or elsewhere. Analyzing the different proposed systems of government the author feels that all of them have but put a different cloak on the skeleton of despotism. He states in conclusion that:

> "The only principle I can think of as coming anywhere near filling this bill is one that we have never tried—freedom."

Mentioning "philosophical anarchism with its profound belief in the essential goodness of Homo Sapiens," the author again calls for a reliance upon man rather than in the change of systems of society which leave man unchanged. He would likely agree with Robert Frost who said, "I bid you to the one man revolution; the only revolution that is coming." Nock quotes Ibsen: "Men still call for special revolutions, for revolutions in politics, in externals. But all that sort of thing is trumpery. It is the soul of man that must revolt."

Nock punctures the idea of liberty being restricted by saying that our governmental leaders conceive as liberty anything which pleases them, but that license is something with which they do not agree. So goes the history of reform; each reformer gaining liberty for himself but denying it to the new minority.

The Remnant is that yeast which works continuously through the masses until finally some semblance of the trust is worked out by portions of the people. This then cannot be taken away from them by a benevolent despot of an iron clad dictator. They have earned this truth for themselves; it has not been given to them; therefore they appreciate it. Nock presents his conclusion of the matter:

> "Hence when Professor Ortega y Gasset declares that mass-control and mass-operation of the State are at present ruinous, we quite agree with him. When we are told that a general domination by the mass is bringing Western civilization to an appaling end, we quite agree.** When we are told that a recurrance of the Dark Ages is at hand, we reply that it is highly probable. When, however, in the face of these prospects, we are invited to abjure republicanism and take up with this or that anti-republican nostrum in order to avert them, we say that we cannot possibly contemplate doing anything of the kind."

Ammon A. Hennacy

*To mix up the masses as is being done here is erroneous, if not far worse. We do not share such a view of the masses.—EDITOR.

**See preceding foot-note,

DISCIPLINE and ANARCHY

Max Stephen

The conception of discipline in military life is clear; order on one side, obedience on the other. In spite of the various relations between officers and subordinates, the principle has never changed; the army's aim is war, it permits nothing human.

But in civil life discipline is multiform. There is a great difference between the totalitarian States and liberal republics. Absolute monarchy and constitutional regimes present such differences that they have justified long and bloody revolutions. The democratic theory, at its roots, assimilates itself with the political conception of libertarian socialism in so far as in its functions there are no masters but representatives. WE KNOW THE SWERVINGS. Still from the divine rights of monarchy to the adulterated democracy the distance is enormous and the oppression more or less unbearable.

Now, to these various degrees of discipline we can add the subjective, personal discipline, called by our Spanish friends the indispensable condition of cohesion and order in the masses' creative activities.

Surely, in playing with words, we can reject discipline by presenting it under its worst aspects, as the enemies of freedom do by recalling the scenes of wild passion and not the best qualities working in unison. We know too well what the privileged of all kinds understand by discipline. In synthesis it is the acceptance of the capitalist society, exploitation of one man by another, militarism, war, State. . . .

Here is a question: With what are we going to replace this method of organization which, in spite of its defects renders possible the existence of a society without which the life of the individual would be illusionary?

For having specialized too much in the criticism of discipline, we not only have created a false conception of Anarchism in those who have kept away from it, but we have also brought about in the minds of Anarchists themselves a sterile mentality so far as social creation is concerned. The latter have been unable to oppose a disciplinary libertarian conception of the one conceived by society.

If we reject discipline in the classical sense of the word, it certainly does not mean that we don't want neither social organization nor individual responsibility. Anarchy, which historically is only the denomination of libertarian Socialism, is a conception of order. Lack of discipline and disorder are to be found in our present society where we see fights between classes, social stratas, parties, industries, business people, peasants, manufacturers, trusts, cartels, among nations. In production, disorder is prevalent, it has no social aim; it provokes vast destructions, leaves a terrible contradiction between its possibilities and the masses' well being; it causes economic swamps and crises which, as time goes on, become more and more intensive. In production we also have financial speculations, fights between the money-men. The disorder slowly but surely strangles the masses by its militarism, and the lowering of the human conscience; there is the ignorance of the masses, international slaughter, and the menace of death to civilization.

This is truly disorder!

And to this, what do we propose? A social organization without divisions and consequently without class-war. A direction of production based upon social needs. General instruction for everybody to the highest degree consistent with society's resources. Suppression of all boundaries, and a universal understanding for production and exchange. Organization of economic life by agrarian and industrial producers' federations and their organisms of distribution. A health service, education, and public service by specialized groups, syndicates, cooperatives, communes, and perhaps new forms which may be created by the revolution, such as the Spanish agrarian collectivities, all of which cooperate with the regional, national, and federal conventions.

We could not wish for a better arrangement nor could we aspire to something closer to common sense. It is a functional and technical conception of a social organization in which basic groups, on their respective territory, will have complete freedom of action; a freedom consistent with the doings of the whole.

Here I say, "consistent with the doing of the whole," because the absolute freedom of the group, and still more of the individual, is a myth. In proportion as the individuals' needs grow and the industrial technique specializes itself, the isolated worker and the nucleus of independent producers, of whom there was so much discussions in the First International, become more impossible.

Fifty years ago Kropotkin, in the "Conquest of Bread," stated that contrary to the customs of bourgeois economists, and even of Marx, the Anarchists were not starting the study of economy by production but by needs, later searching for the means to satisfy them. In 1897 Malatesta affirmed that the producer's free group was a Utopia. "To believe," he said, "that if everyone worked at a venture when and just as he liked, without bothering about the needs of others and without subordinating his personal activity to the collective good, to believe that in so doing, at the end of a year, we would have produced wealth, machines, and vegetables to satisfy the wants of everybody—would be like leaving the whole thing to God."

And he concluded:

"Man must live in society, and to live he must have an understanding with other men. Either this cooperation will take place voluntarily, by free pacts, or it will be done by force."

There can only be two solutions. That is the reason why Anarchists who do not accept, but only conceive the negative aspects of our ideas, are the best auxiliaries to dictatorship and governmental solutions to which they often rally. Being unable to conceive this voluntary cooperation, this libertarian positive order, they justify what Malatesta called the imposed cooperation, which is nothing else but slavery.

However, the opinions of these two theorists of Anarchy plainly justify what is called to-day the planned economy, a term I point out, not to dwell in considerations that would take us away from our subject, but to govern my thoughts and try to untangle a principle. The full and complete freedom of production could have been justified in the 18th and 19th centuries when the prodigious increase in needs, the continual technical revolution, and the opening of new markets on all continents offered an outlet for the great majority of products. To-day all that has changed.

Moreover the understanding of economy and morale has always been and always will continue to be the advisability to produce in quantity and quality that which is necessary for consumption. Increasing technical advancement in industry forces us to conceive production as not a free function of an independent nucleus. That is partially what is taking place nowadays in spite of international trusts and cartels.

Well, is the libertarian society going to reproduce, in making it worse, the disorder of Capitalism? And I say, "in making it worse," because the industrial captains can adapt their production or selling possibilities, while with such conceptions of Anarchy no one would accept its itinerary. Nevertheless, not to wish it is not enough. We must know what to do to avoid it. We must have an idea how we could satisfy the wants of all, how to coordinate work, transportation, and distribution, and how to assure public service and useful activities.

But before tracing plans for this question, an essential work is imposing itself. Each and everyone must acquire the conviction that the subordination of individual activity to social needs is inevitable and even desirable, for it constitutes one of the main manifestations of sociable feelings without which the existence of collectivities would be impossible.

Let us then admit that as producers we are not free. The limitless needs of modern men, the numerous specializations, imposed on one side by the technical production which becomes more and more complicated as its infinite variety expands, and on the other side by geographic determinism, renders this freedom to produce at random completely impossible.

* * *

An objection: "If, as you affirm, freedom does neither exist in production nor in consumption, if we cannot do as we want to, what is then the practical difference between Anarchism and the authoritarian State, and libertarian Socialism and the political Socialism?"

The abstract, absolute, and metaphysic conception of Anarchy has done us great harm and has provided our opponents with too many weapons. Regardless of our great love for independence we still remain slaves to our material, sentimental and intellectual needs. To satisfy them we must have an understanding with others and reckon with their existence. Any theory that makes abstractions of these elementary, and at the same time, superior factors, is only a vague declamation, or a philosophical simulation. Since we have to satisfy our wants and must maintain these continual relations, the best methods and understanding are necessary. Our brain alone cannot protect us against cold. We are unable to escape the laws of nature. Bakunin said it before us, "What we fight is not the tyranny of necessity, but the tyranny of men."

Thus we wish for freedom to do everything by ourselves, and not freedom to do nothing. Such was Proudhon's claim.

And to maintain the necessary coordination among all activities, to assure the permanent function of producers' federations, organisms of exchange, and public service, we want delegates.

Now delegates are fundamentally opposed to masters. A delegate nominated by members of an econmic organization does not command, he simply fulfills a function. He always remains in the hands of those who nominate him; they may criticize his actions, and remove him at any time. His economic resources in a socialized society would be fixed by the whole. He could not, by his own initiative, nominate other delegates and could not impose himself.

Kropotkin pointed out examples of non-dictatorial organizations which, though not perfect according to our libertarian point of view, are nevertheless essentially much closer to us than the authoritarian bodies.

. . . We do not claim the right not to produce nor the right to ignore the needs of others. . . .

(Translated from "*Le Libertaire*" By JULES SCARCERIAUX.)

An Evening with Elisee Reclus

In the summer of the year 1889 *I came into the office of the Freiheit (Freedom) that comrade John Most edited in New York City. His first words were: "Rudash—if you would have come but five minutes earlier you would have met Reclus*—he was here just now." I don't believe that Most was any the less sorrier than myself.*

Two years later, in the summer of 1891, *comrade Dr. H. Salataroff came into the office of the Freie Arbeiter Stimme (Free Worker's Voice) and called me over to show me a visiting card of comrade Elisee Reclus and written on it in pencil: "I would like to shake hands with you and your brother anarchists." When Reclus came to see Salataroff, two other patients were awaiting their turn. Reclus waited a while and then left the above card.*

Comrade Salataroff asked me if I would not try to locate Reclus. I recalled a comrade who spoke French and knew some of the French comrades. I asked him to find it out for us. Within a few days he brought me the address.

One evening Salataroff and myself went to that address. When we rang the bell Reclus opened the door for us. We found there another man, but he soon left, and soon we were alone with comrade Reclus.

As the discussion about our ideas and the social conditions throughout the world developed, comrade Reclus pointed out to us the mistake of thinking that: the worse the people are off—the better it is for the chances of rebellion. He happened to be in Ireland during a failure of the potato crop, people were dying by the waysides and nobody revolted. He also related to us that the most effective anarchist movement in France was not in the big industrial centers, but in the provinces.

He asked us the kind of activities we were carrying on for the movement. We told him about our holding of lectures, mass meetings, helping to organize trade unions, helping in strikes. He suggested that the organization of schools for children would be more practical.

We spent the entire evening with him. Then we suggested the idea of our calling a meeting of all the comrades, since we thought that it would be wrong we should be the only ones to meet him. But all our arguments proved in vain. He doesn't wish that the comrades should think of him, as of any one more important than the other ones.

It was about midnight when we parted.

Many years later, whilst sitting in the house of comrade Salataroff he showed me the same pencil-enscribed card that Reclus had left. The comradely reception he gave us I shall treasure till the last days of my life.

I. Rudash

* * *

*Elisee Reclus was the world renown Geologist. Most of his works on this subject are translated in many languages. —EDITOR.

COMRADE I. RUDASH

On March 26, 1938, our collaborator comrade I. Rudash died at the age of 76. He spent his last days at the Old Age Home in Washington City where he resided for many years.

Comrade Rudash was one of the pioneers in the Jewish anarchist movement of this country. He was born in Vilna on Dec. 15, 1862. He came to the U. S. in 1885. His activities were of a wide nature and extended to other language-speaking movements as well. Chiefly he wrote in the London "Arbeiter Freund" (Worker's Friend) and in the "Freie Arbeiter Stimme" (Free Worker's Voice). Since the appearance of MAN! he began sending us reminiscences of his former activities and of the personalities of the movement.

Comrade Rudash treasured the memories of Peter Kropotkin and Elisee Reclus. The above reminiscence of his meeting Reclus is the last contribution he sent us. He worked with John Most in the German anarchist movement and became one of his stauncheest friends.

Several years ago Comrade Rudash sent to MAN! a detailed account of an unpleasant occurrence at a meeting where he was chairman, and John Most the speaker. Due to some personal reasons, Emma Goldman jumped on the platform and attempted to hit Most. His version was totally different from the one given by E. G. in her autobiography. Nevertheless, I refrained from publishing this reminiscence because the very attempt of using force as an argument between anarchists is in itself unanarchistic, and whether she attempted to hit Most with a real horse whip as contended by her, or with a play-toy whip as claimed by comrade Rudash, makes no difference in the final analysis of the discreditable act.

I do not recall having met comrade Rudash although I might have when I lectured in Washington about twelve years ago. We corresponded, though, very often.

His interesting reminiscences will be missed by those of us who value the background of everything that really matters—the human being behind the ideas—one expounds.

M. G.

For the First Time Translated into English

DOES GOD EXIST?

By SEBASTIEN FAURE

Ten Cents Per Copy Obtainable through MAN!

MILITARISM, ANARCHISM AND "ABSOLUTE" FASCISM

One of the greatest merits of our old and venerable French comrade Sebastien FAURE is to inspire our movement continually to new thoughts, to a continuous revaluation of our principles, and thereby leading to ever higher and clearer conceptions. From this point of view he has done a great service to the cause of international Anarchism, in having dared to approach the most burning question within our international movement—a problem upon which depends the entire future of the anarchistic idea.

I may say, just in the light of the Spanish events, that the solution of the problem between "absolute" pacifism and violence is so pertinent and urgent that it dissolves into the question:

Do we, as anarchists, wish to preserve our movement from shipwreck and utter self-destruction—and lead it to a victory which alone will be worthy of a higher culture, necessarily the basis out of which will inevitably grow the realization of Anarchism? Or are we incapable of achieving this?

Between such alternatives the international movement of Anarchism stands today. While I have, theoretically, forseen this to come for the last 25 years, the Spanish tragedy has brought this problem in a very abruptive and unexpected way to a climax.

The article by our venerable comrade Sebastien Faure (see *"Le Libertaire,"* Paris, September 2nd, 1937*) is written in such a noble vein of objectively searching the truth, that it is characteristic, by its great errors which I allow myself to find in it, for the lack of insight into the whole problem, as it devolves itself for the anarchists and Anarchism. If a man of the grand capacities of Sebastien Faure is not comprehending the problem, what can one expect from the rank and file of our movement? And just for these it is of the utmost importance.

* * *

In the first place it is an error to say that the adherents of non-violence refuse to make any distinction between war as such and the social revolution, that they claim both to be the same, therefore reject both.

This statement is so totally wrong that I may say for myself, that in more than twenty years of theoretical dissertations about this problem — my finished book (since 1925) on *"Violence, Non-violence and the Social Revolution,"* could never appear, on account of lack of monetary funds—I have always maintained, and proven, that the Social Revolution and War are two absolutely distinct and contradictory and antagonistic principles. Whoever says war, is practically eliminating and rejecting the social revolution, from an anarchistic point of view. Each one of these two principles and actions is incompatible with the other one. So much that I, who is firmly convinced of the principle of the social revolution as the only means of reaching the social emancipation of the workers, which I conceive solely rendered possible by Anarchism, have always rejected violence and war on the ground of them being in contradistinction to the Social revolution.

This, probably to many comrades astounding, declaration will become clearer when I say that it is just this standpoint of mine which has led me to recognize the deplorable fact, that as much as the idea of the social emancipation owes to Anarchism for the scientific and intellectual as well as honest and only logical clarity of the real quintessence of emancipation, from the standpoint of the worker as also of the humanitarian, still, Anarchism has not yet offered, in the course of its development from Godwin-Stirner-Proudhon, the real modern methods of the struggle and the fundamental elaboration for the realization of a Social Revolution. All what Bakunine and Kropotkine have done in this line, is in conformity with examples which they took out of the revolutionary *concepts of the political revolutions* of the bourgeoisie, trying to adapt these methods to the benefits of the workers—*which is impossible!* Because there is the greatest difference conceiveable between the aim of any political and of the social revolution.

History has, thus far, only shown political revolutions, having invariably as their aim and object and nucleus the overthrow of one set of rulers and putting another one into governmental power. This is the real being of every political revolution. Not having had a real social revolution as a precept as yet, it stands to reason that Anarchism is here lacking any and every historical guidance. Its still unfulfilled mission is to *elaborate its own conception of the Social Revolution* upon the strength and truth of the *anarchistic* principles.

This has not yet been done within the anarchist thought and movement in a considerable measure. Most of the anarchists, who are for the social revolution, believe that it can be carried through and can be effected by those means which have been the means and methods of the political revolution, i. e., weapons, revolutionary militarism, civil war, if needs be war. And they hope, by these means to arrive, sooner or later, at anarchism.

This latter belief is a folly. Any revolution, using the means and methods of the historically known *political* revolutions (weapons, revolutionary army, civil war and terrorism, as we know them historically) will, and can, *never* arrive at the *social* revolution, and still much less at anarchism.

As long as the anarchists do not recognize this and have not themselves elaborated the methods of the new "warfare," namely that of a scientifically and social—economically based constructive activity of a social revolution—they are very concisely elaborated in my unpublished book—the anarchists will not achieve a social revolution, in accordance with anarchism. On the contrary, they will always, when being strong enough to be a social-revolutionary factor, become the abused, outraged and maltreated plaything, toy, of those who consistently adhere to the political revolution, recognizing the conquest of violence as their political aim. Anarchists, not understanding the absolute difference between the social and the political revolution, will always become a prey to politicians and parties of democracy, of republicanism, of social democracy and of bolshevism (which is a sort of marxian fascism, *arrived* at power!). We witness all this in a most terrible and painful way at present in Spain.

As there is a fundamental difference in the aims and objcets between the social and political revolution, it follows that there, necessarily, must be also an absolute difference between the employed and available means.

Thus it follows that it is impossible to achieve the social revolutoin by means of weapons, militarism, civil war, being based upon the same methods as all other war. From this standpoint the real anarchist is an *absolute pacifist* towards and against all the weapons of militarism, which is nothing else than the apparatus of the function of and for violence. In opposition *to this form of violence* the real anarchist is an adherent of non-violence, not because he is against the social revolution, but because he recognizes that any and every form of militarism is an absolute antagonism of and to the social revolution, aiming at the realization of a society without organized violence, i. e., anarchism.

Out of all this there does by no means flow the sequence that the anarchist—who himself is an absolute pacifist and opponent to all historically known forms of violence—should be an opponent or a belittler of the great historical revolutions which mankind has had in antiquity, in the medieval ages, in the 17th and 18th centuries, still down to 1848, 1917 and 1918. By no means! But what the anarchist as absolute pacifist contends is that all these revolutions have not been *social* revolutions, nor did they, in their aims, attempt to realize the aim of a social revolution.

Whenever and wherever it was tried, by means of the political revolution to convert it into a social revolution—in 1917, 1918, 1921 (by Makhno, in the Ukraine of Russia) and lately 1936—this attempt has failed. Not because the revolutionists were not strong enough to carry through their aims, but because they used those methods of violence—military—which were, and will always be, futile, as they are in contradistinction to the aims of a social revolution in accordance to anarchism. Means become the despots of men, the latter must inevitably fall a prey to the former.

How little the real meaning of the methods of a social revolution are as yet comprehended, is proven, if such an erudite, magnificent clear mind like that of our beloved pioneer Sebastien Faure, can believe that the difference between the followers of absolute pacifism or non-violence and those of violence and civil war, is rooted in the legality or illegality of the action. For him Switzerland, Germany, etc., with their long course of legal methods of democracy are the examples of absolute pacifism or non-violence. It is by no means thus!

In the same error one falls if one believes that when the Italians and the Germans were subjugated by Mussolini and Hitler, this was due to the fact that they were downed into submission as "absolute pacifists," as non-violents.

Quite the contrary is true. The victory of fascism over the workers of those countries is due to the fact that the vast majority of organized workers in the socialist parties did believe in the efficacy of weapons. Did the Italian anarchist and syndicalist not atttack fascism with armed methods? Did the Italian communist and social democrat not believe in violent methods for defensive purposes, and against fascism? Neither in Italy nor in Germany did the fascists gain their victory without having had to loose in quite many skirmishes and fights, waged by armed force! Germany had its social democratic "Reichswehr" (founded by that party), the "communists" there had their "Red Front," armed, militaristic bodies. True, they failed to deliver their last, decisive battle; probably, because they, at last, recognized its uselessness. But in Austria, social democracy as well as national socialists, have in 1934 tried it, under the most hopeful and propitious aspects, with the aid of militaristic-strategical, well-drilled organizations, strongly armed. Still, they have failed to gain a victory!

As a whole it is surprising to read how comrade Sebastien Faure wants to make out that the weapons of absolute pacifism and non-violence have always failed and succombed their adherents to failure. While it is a matter of clear fact: since the Paris Commune of 1871, everywhere the methods of only military violence, of armed resistance, have absolutely failed, have only heaped useless sacrifice upon sacrifice and weakened the social movement ever and anon for decades. And wherever—seemingly—these military, armed methods have conquered, as in Russia, they have led to the reverse and absolute counterpart of the social revolution, at which they aimed.

The plain truth is that the methods of absolute pacifism and non-violence—in contradistinction to militarist methods and means, to weapons—have as yet never been adopted, never as yet been elaborated, and never as yet been carried through with all the strategical weight and technical skill there rests in absolute pacifism and non-violence, as understood by the anarchist conception of the social revolution.

In order to show only one example of the difference in the conception of the absolute pacifist-anarchist and the adherent of violence, I will mention only the following:

It was at the beginning of August, 1936. Our entire movement was in favor of the civil war in Spain, clamoring for weapons and armaments to be sent to our unfortunate Spanish comrades. At that time I pointed out, in a circular-letter, mailed to 10 of our French newspapers, that this war cannot be decided by sending arms to the Spanish comrades, because this same feat can be done by Portugal, Italy and Germany too, and on a larger scale. It was a problem of *preventing* these latter to send arms, etc., and in this action one must not only rely upon that governmental humbug, called the League of Nations, but upon the mass of organized labor, in its consumptive, productive-communicative power. A general strike and boycott, I wrote, against the import and export of Portugal, Italy and Germany must be organized on the most rigid scale. It will prevent these governments of aiding and abetting Franco, and the revolutionary war in Spain will soon be won by Madrid-Barcelona.

My circular was published only by some of the journals to which I sent it. So unpopular was it at that time to give one (of many others) method of absolute pacifism and non-violence as a means of combating the fascist intervention war against Spain. But what has happened since? Exactly one year later, in July, 1937, the National Committee of the C.N.T. demanded of our foreign movement: "Render help to Spanish Anti-fascism! Organize a boycott against all fascistic goods and against their commerce!" (See "Llamado de la CNT. a los trabajadores!".) This call comes one year —too late!

My article becomes too long, the subject is too tremendously large; it cannot be answered in one article, anyhow.

Our beloved comrade Sebastien Faure has demanded that the absolute pacifists and adherents of non-violence should answer him in a frank and loyal way. I have attempted to do it, with all the love and appreciation I cherish foor him during more than three decades.

In resuming my answer and coming to a finish, I only wish to say this as yet:

Those of us who are anarchists, absolute pacifists and adherents of non-violence, appreciate all and every effort of democracy, liberalism, republicanism and so forth against fascism, in order to uphold the ideals of the liberal and democratic state against all sorts of dictatorships. We wish they should stir and act by far more than they do and with any weapons and means they please.

But, as anarchists, we must clearly comprehend that their means are those of governmentalism, in consonance with *their* social-political conceptions. Undoubtedly the aims of anarchism are absolutely different from those of democracy and marxism in all its phases. Let, therefore, the anarchists struggle according to their aim, with the means appropriate to it; because only under these circumstances, if they act thus, will they carry through *their own work,* which nobody will do for them.

The social revolution, leading towards anarchism;

Pierre Ramus

*Comrade Ramus refers to the first of the three articles that have appeared in the last three issues of MAN!, and which were translated from "Le Libertaire."—EDITOR.

CIVILIZATION TODAY

"I am tired of all these people who govern states from the recesses of their garrets; these legislators who rule the world at two cents a sheet—unable to govern their wives or their households they take great pleasure in regulating the universe." (Voltaire.) And what a sorry job they have made of it.

Today, throughout the world, we find more poverty and misery among the great percentage of the people than at any time in the past, and this condition prevails in spite of the fact that necessities of all kinds can be produced far in excess of what the people can consume.

We prate about our progress, but wherein does this progress lie? Certainly not in the intellectual development of the race. In a recent article by Sir W. Arbuthnot Lane, M. D., Bart., C. B., M. S., F. R. C. S. he states: "The tendency of our present educational system is to prevent the majority of children's mind from developing beyond the child level. Really adult minds are relatively few in the civilized communities of today."

Our present progress rests upon a purely mechanical base, and as this mechanical development has forged ahead in like ratio has the intelligence of the masses degenerated. Unscrupulous men, with the assistence of the political state, have taken possession of the earth and its fullness thereof and enslaved the people.

The machine, under private ownership, destroys initiative and subjects the worker to a daily monotonous existence. Like a cog of a wheel he becomes a part of the machine he operates—a mere robot in the scheme of things.

HUBER

ART and LITERATURE

ON THE ROAD

(IN SPAIN TODAY.)

"Mother, stop a little—do. I am so tired."

"Poor child, but we dare not stop. We must go on," and the mother clasped her little one's hand tighter and hurried on.

"Mother, are we leaving our nice clean house?"

"Yes child."

"Forever and ever, Mother?"

"Yes child," the mother answered with a sob in her voice."

"Oh, mother, I don't want to go. I want to go back."

"We cannot, baby. We must go on . . ."

"But why, Mother, I am so tired and my feet hurt," the child started to cry. "Hush dear," the mother stopped, wiped the little girl's tears, kissed her and then said, "You will be brave, dear, like your father? You remember, I told you he went to try and help stop these bad men from coming into our city?" The little girl nodded. "Well, he and the other men, they couldn't stop them, and these men will come, are very near the city now. We don't want to be there when they come in—for they are too wicked—so we must run away. Now—you understand—and you will be brave?"

The child nodded again and said, "Yes, Mother." For a little while they went on in silence. Overhead came the roar of motors, sometimes not very far from them a shell burst. Then the child would shiver in terror.

Other people were on the road, walking, riding, running, even limping, going hurriedly as best as they could; weeping children, babes in arms, women prematurely gray with faces pale and gaunt from weeks lived in terror and hunger; fear clouding their eyes, fear of the present, dread of the future; old men, faces lined and careworn, all hurried on, some carried their most precious possessions, pillows or a bundle of clothes, a sheep, a pet, or perhaps, if fortunate, a little food. They would be gone before the enemy seized the town —(this enemy who showed such ruthlessness and heartlessness even before capturing the town). The homes they had built, the animals they had loved and tended, the gardens they had nurtured with pride, all were left behind—better to run while life still pulsed within. . . . Simple people, dazed and terror-stricken, uprooted from their beloved native soil, all tramping together. The road stretched long and dusty in the hot sun.

Again the little girl cried, "Mother, I am so hungry." "Here Vida, this is all I have. I saved it for you. Eat it slowly," and her mother, Gabriela, handed her a dry crust of stale bread.

"It is good, mother," the little girl said. She did not notice the tears in her mother's eyes.

"Mother, where we go to—we won't have to go to garbage piles to look for something to eat?"

'No, child."

"That's good. I hated to get things from that ugly place. It's so dirty and smelly there."

"Hush, child. We must make haste. Don't talk and we will go faster."

"I can't go faster. My feet hurt too much—and I am so afraid." Gabriela nodded to people who passed them on the road. "Are all these people running away from those bad people too, Mother?"

"Yes, child."

"And will we come to a nice house again, with flowers like we had, and pigs and chickens and cows, and Papa, will he come there too?" and the child prattled on, holding tightly her crust of bread and skipping now and then.

They heard the roar of the planes overhead and again the child shivered in dread. "They are—they must be coming, mother," she whispered in fear. Just then a loud noise was heard, a shell burst about a hundred feet away. Gabriela crossed herself as she clasped her little one's hand closer. "Ave Maria," she whispered. Then she cried out. Just ahead of them an old man had been hobbling along holding a little girl by the hand. He dropped the hand and fell down as a fragment of the shell hit him. The little girl screamed as he fell. Gabriela ran up to them. She helped the old man over to a shady spot and he lay down. His foot was bleeding badly. Gabriela tore her petticoat and bound up the wound. The old man thanked her in a whisper. "You are kind, daughter, my grand child, my daughter's little girl—you will take her with you?" Weeping, Gabriela said, "Yes." The old man continued, "I cannot walk any more, and my heart, my heart is pretty bad. But I am glad to die here, near my home. All my life I spent here . . ." Gabriela tried to make him comfortable, but the old man said, "Never mind, daughter, don't worry about me. I have lived my life. But take care of my little granddaughter, Concha?"

"I will, I will," Gabriela cried, "Concha and Vida will grow up as sisters." The old man leaned back. "I am glad. I could not continue this struggle, or this march—much more anyhow. I was too weary . . . but I dared not stop for little Concha's sake, but now . . . I . . . can . . . rest . . ." His voice grew hoarser and he spoke with difficulty.

Gabriela took Concha's and Vida's hands and said, "We three will go on and get help for your granddaddy." I don't need help," he said, "But do you go on and reach safety, daughter. Let Concha know her parents were brave and true. They died fighting for the liberty of their home." Gabriela wept. "Alas, so all the good brave people die now. So too, my dear husband was killed." The old man slowly shook his head, "I cannot understand, I cannot understand—all this. We were happy—God—smiled on us—sunshine was on our land . . . and in our hearts . . . then . . . this war . . . and now . . . there is only misery . . . and death . . ." Gabriela could hardly hear him now and bent lower. A couple, an elderly man and woman who were running came closer. Gabriela stood up. "Please," she said to them, the tears streaming down her wan cheeks. "This old man, he was hit, he is dying. Will you stay with him—for a little while? That he may not depart alone? . . ." The couple nodded sympathetically. Gabriela continued. "I have my little girl, and I am taking his little grandchild. I want to reach a house before nightfall, so I must hurry." The man and woman nodded. "Yes, we will stay," the man reassured her kindly, "Go . . . and may you reach a house safely with your little ones."

Gabriela thanked them and clasping each child by the hand bent down and said good-bye to the old man.

"Good-by . . . good-by, my daughter, you are kind . . . Good-by . . . Concha." He could no longer see, but he touched her with his trembling hand. Concha, weeping kissed him. "Granddaddy, Granddaddy," she sobbed.

"Come, dear," Gabriela said gently, "We must hurry, we want to go to a house where we can get food and a place to sleep." "I want Granddaddy. He must come with us," she sobbed.

The old man became unconscious and did not hear her, but Gabriela took the little girl's hand and said again, gently. "Concha, dear, your granddaddy cannot walk, those bad men we are running away from have hurt him too much. We must run on or they will hurt us too."

"Yes," said Vida, "and see Concha, I will give you some of this if you will come." She took her tiny precious bit of stale bread and broke it in half. Her mother smiled through her tears as she watched. Concha took the bread eagerly and the three went on. . . .

Lilly Sarnoff

LOVE and VIRTUE

"Love" and "Virtue", the lines along which . . . I have tried a little to explore and know, I regard as two main paths along which the human organism seeks to find for itself development and expression. . . .. The love that I have in mind is that which secretly inspires a virtue which refuses to yield weakly to circumstances of a world moulded by dead heroisms of a past it has outgrown. It comes forward with its own heroisms to guide life into new forms, even if in so doing it must sweep away too old moralities to set up other moralities more in accordance with the increased knowledge of our days.

I see government entrusted to men of no virtue, by the votes of men and women made of the same stuff, and guided by principles—if they deserve the name—that may once have been those of sanity but in the light of a later eye are imbecility.

HAVELOCK ELLIS

About the Photos

The photo of Ralph Waldo Emerson that appeared in the March issue was from a reproduction of a plaque made by our diversified comrade Jules Scarceriaux, as also the above photo of Havelock Ellis.

In his spare time, he is always to be found in his creative pottery-shop, joyfully at work at this art task. No affair is complete without the many contributed plaques by comrade Scarceriaux—for the benefit of our propaganda. He will be happy to make a specially enscribed plaque of any of the photo reproductions that have or will appear in MAN! with any new subscription or renewal, at no extra cost. Since the cuts are breakable, only those within the Los Angeles area can avail themselves of this generous offer. Outside of the Los Angeles area plaques will be sent at the risk of those ordering same, plus shipping charges.

AN EAGLE CAME FLOATING

An eagle came floating through the grey of dawn
A threatening cloud in the sky at breaking of day;
Searching prey!

He glimpsed a suckling cayote, that vandal beast of the plains, strayed from its mother's side and now doomed lost child of the furried wastes.
For the eagle is fast descending, a calm possessed mass of death.
He strikes! A storm in furry, engulfing.

His wings flap.
He rises into the air,
But leaves an empty abyss below.
The wails of a cayote rends the breeze;
One of her litter is no more
A feable straw it was in a furried storm;
A child kidnapped from its mother's arms.

Yet this is our symbol of freedom and justice,
This out-law of the mountain range,
This winged demon of the craig bordered plains.

J. C. CREWS

* * *

SPRING IS STEALING BACK

Crash and bang and grinding grinding,
Grist and grist for fortune's mill;
Spinning vortex, blinding blinding,
Eating soul through like a drill.

God! What purpose all this giving
Day and year without respite;
To what purpose all the living,
Ending ragged like a kite,

Clinging to a post in tatters,
Knowing it no longer matters—
Spring is stealing back tonight!

JEANETTE SELETZ

* * *

INDIAN SUMMER

I.

They sounded the tocsin once.

Through the sirocco
Come up with night the wheels, the long steel cylinders
Sand-scoured, wind-etched
In delicate, fatalistic design.
The hooves in the sand make surf,
And the night is long on the earth
As on a sea overlooking old enterprise frozen in coral
And the incorruptible feeding polyps and sea lilies.

This is an old march over tired,
Steel-grooved, and blood-soaked lands.
There are no eyes
To open with the wonder of precise
Death balanced on a spinning marble; nor to note

How destiny its troubled hour assumes
Over the headland and the wreck-strewn dune.

II.

They sounded the tocsin twice.

No foot of land is bought
But dearly by my lover's life, the light
Of my brother's eyes, and an old man's
Wistful hour in the afternoon sun.
What have I done
That aliens should proudly
Give to me Spain in return for Spanish earth?

On the Guadalajaras
Raise a monument for them: a black pillar of fire:
An obelisk carved in their twenty languages
To outstand the centuries that ate Egypt and Sumeria.
Carve on it, "All men are brothers"
As a wise and benign saying to the ages that discover
What war harrows over.

III.

They sounded the tocsin three times.

Sleepers, wake!
Morning blows a sampan into the brake,
And the guns blow the sampan back
Ebbing reed and cotton.
The deep voice cries across Shanghai
Pouff! Pouff! and wings
Spring up—oh, wake!

For the unhearing are those flayed on the concrete
Or blown through the masonry—those
Unflexed by bayonets and deaf
To the last as to the first and second struck
(From steel and bronze, the troubled bell-note winging):

Alarums of the winter on the world.

LLEWELLYN AP-RHYS

CORRESPONDENCE and DISCUSSION

Give me the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to conscience, above all liberties. —JOHN MILTON

Two Letters From Palestine

Palestine, Aug. 20, 1937.

Dear Comrade:

Only now I have got back the MAN! after they "visited" other comrades through the country. I read and read them and though I am disagreeing with you in some things I think that MAN! is the best journal I had ever seen in English.

Especially hurt me your statement toward the disturbances in Palestine in August, 1936, and also the statement of your collaborator, Samuel Palinov, published in the FREIE ARBEITER STIME. I would have written in particulars about the situation in Palestine, but now I want only to express you my best wishes, and to tell you that in the last August number there was nothing that I could disagree with. The article of Voltairine De Celyre appealed very much to me and I am really sorry that I have no money to do my part in helping you to publish it in a pamphlet form.

J. T.

* * *

Palestine, August 25th, 1937.

Dear Comrade:

Just wanted to send you this short letter when I received yours. I thank you very much for it. And I am trying to answer some of your questions.

A. Of course our circles are against the partition of Palestine; first because we didn't loose our faith that there is a possibility of mutual understanding with the Arabs, and secondly because we are against the Jewish State, following the ideals of the first laleos pioneers to Palestine who were (A. B. Gordon and I. Ch. Brener) very near to Anarchism and stated their ideal is "not a Jewish State but a free creative settlement", a "Human-Nation" striving for self-determination and not-assimilated culture." These men founded the communal movement which numbers now more than 12,000 members, but who did not follow their founders. These communards' life is very near to the anarchist ideals because they are giving, each one according to his ability, and each one receives according to his needs. The communes are membered by Zionist-socialist-democrats and other Marxist Parties. And we Anarchists are only a little number scattered among many cummunes, and though in the last year we more than doubled our number we are known as members of a commune, but not as anarchists.

B. That is the reason why we cannot get money for our anarchist activity. Of course we cannot send you handcraft for the same reason. We are very busy now, in our new movement. Of course I hope to write in the future for MAN! in Hebrew and shall find some one among my friends who will translate it into English.

Best wishes to wou and to MAN!.

J. T.

* * *

Since Governmental persecution of anarchists is universal, we are omitting the name of the Commune from which the two letters came, as also the name of the writer—EDITOR.

* * *

Our Position on the CNT-FAI

Comrade Graham:

The three issues of "MAN!", Oct.-Dec., which you sent, I enjoyed reading. From a cultural viewpoint, it is quite an excellent little publication.

Also, I agree most heartily with the criticism of the CNT-FAI for entering into bourgeois politics I believe it is possible to draw a clear line between the leadership and membership of the CNT-FAI; sooner or later the Vanguard group of anarcho-syndicalists will awake to the realization of that fact. Not even the most involved explanations and excuses will stand up against the lessons of history.

There is only one thing I cannot understand: how it is that you can call Stalin and his clique "Marxists" and "Bolsheviks." Even a superficial examination of Marxism should convince one that Stalin is anti-Marxist, as are all the groups, almost without exception, of the Communist International. I think it actually an honor to them to call such unspeakably anti-labor and reactionary creatures "Marxists." They are far below that point, in reality.

Wish you the best of luck in your present fight against the Powers That Be.

CLIFTON BENNETT

(The histories relating to the life-activities of Karl Marx, and in particular, his mistreatment of Michael Bakunin, show, that Stalin, as Lenin and Trotsky, have but all been acting as faithful disciples of Marx.—EDITOR.)

* * *

The Road to Progress

Dear Graham:

The October, 1935, issue was very good, not because you printed a letter of mine with adverse comment, but because you have stated in it so many opinions concerning the social issue. Would it not be well to analyze them? I do not think though that an analysis of opinions according to the dialectic method can bring us nearer the truth, for this only an objective inquiry into the actual conditions of society can do, but it would help to clarify the issues themselves, we must, above all, come to an understanding that competition and co-operation are, as I wrote in the letter you have printed, mutually exclusive, because they signify different, that is antagonistic emotional states or attitudes. Max Stirner has, as I gladly concede, contributed much to the clarification of the social issues. His insistence upon the rights of the individual are quite in order, and his enumeration of the 'spooks' which are used to force the masses to direct their attention away from themselves and toward that which is intangible in itself, such as the cross, patriotism, the love of humanity, etc., are just observations; yet, with all of his deep insight, he did not see that there never can be a society of egoists. The future society cannot be built up upon the competitive attitude of mankind, it must be built upon the cooperative one. Kropotkin and Tolstoy are right here, and Stirner is not.

If the time should ever come that we should not be allowed to express our ideas or criticize the opinions of the great anarchist leaders, we might just as well close shop. There are many good ideas expressed in the letters of the anarchist leaders, which you have printed in this issue, but there is also much contradiction in them. Kropotkin speaks of forces, especially the force of revolution with which no individual is able to cope. Yet he is an individualist. And Hippolyte Havel in his article "The Fallacy of Leadership" with which I much agree, contradicts himself in his last paragraph: The only leadership needed is the leadership of those who have lost all conceit of country, property and social and intellectual superiority.

I confess it is a knotty problem, and just for that reason should we give much thought to it. It is, in fact, the social problem: individual liberty within society. But it does not consist in isolating the individual as Stirner proposes, nor can we have it, if we assume, as does Marx, and in his article Kropotkin, that man is subject to the governance of ulterior forces. We must on the contrary recognize, that the control of society can be brought about only, by teaching individual man to control himself, which can be done only in a co-operative commonwealth. That is exactly what the Christian religion (pardon me, if I mention it) teaches in some of its sayings.

It is foolish to assume that there is no difference in men. There are dull and very bright men. We need some kind of leadership here, we cannot get away from it. But the crux of the question, as I understand the problem, lies in this: in the method of education and in its goal. We must devise methods of education which will educate not toward leadership, but toward self-control. All culture rests on self-control or purposeful activities. No man can become an artist unless he follows those rules which the nature of his art imposes upon him. And if this is different for every man who has an original personality, it is nevertheless well defined. And so it is with the writer and the thinker. The subject matter itself demands a definite treatment; style and organization of the stuff must be appropriate to the subject-matter itself. And this can be worked out only by closest concentration; in this lies its discipline. Thus then the only kind of true discipline is individual, is self-control. To help the child find the way toward this discipline and self-control is the true art and office of the educator. But this educator does not stand before the child saying: This way please! Follow me? in which case he would be a leader, for he would lead the child on to his, the leader's own goal, as do Hitler and Mussolini in a way,—in so far as they can be said to be leading at all; but he must stand behind the child, letting him go his own way, and merely pointing out error or deficiencies, if he sees them.

And here again we are concerned about the attitude. That all which ultimately counts is the attitude with which we meet our fellow men, seems not yet sufficiently understood by most of the progressive or radical thinkers. They are still immersed in a crude and stupid materialism. Their concept of happiness is the quantity of things, possession, it is not quality of individual effort, as it should be.

Once the progressive elements of mankind shall see this clearly, I hope they will find themselves together, instead of fighting one another. We may then hope for real progress.

F. WERGTEN

On The Block

And the Communists have dedicated a memorial to Lenin, eh? Well, well, well! Too bad tovaristch Lenin can't reciprocate by dedicating a memorial to communism. . . .

* * *

"Anarchy is now raging in North China," comments the capitalist press on the Chinese guerilla warfare against the Japanese invaders.

Those Chinese are an ungrateful lot; they don't know how to appreciate when a law-abiding people comes to ravage their country. We certainly intend to give them a piece of our mind—the damned anarchists.

* * *

Here's a tip we have for comrade Stalin anent his trial of the 21 Bolsheviks (long since liquidated). We got it from reliable sources. Shh—, don't let anyone hear it. It's been rumored Bukharin not only intended to kill Gorky but even plotted to assasinate Tutakhamen. . . .

* * *

Extra! Extra! Eden resigned as prime minister of England.

So, what! We still get our doughnuts with holes in 'em. . . .

* * *

Isn't it funny that all Bolsheviks Stalin puts on trial accuse themselves as being spies, bandits, traitors, etc.

Goodness gracious, who were the guys that made the October revolution?

* * *

Poor us, the other night our cat had a rendezvous with a great big tommy and not a line appeared in Windshield's column. . . .

* * *

Our only fear now is that after all Bolsheviks are shot out there won't be anybody left to shoot the shooter. . . .

* * *

Incidentally, what magic power does that little fellow Trotsky possess that he can spell so much fear on Stalin from a Mexican village? Should it be that the pen is really mightier than the sword? We hardly can believe it—not from the way it carries on lately. . . .

* * *

Anyhow, to this department it looks very queer that on the very same day the 21 Bolsheviks were put on trial, all workers in Soviet Union passed resolutions for their condemnation. Do they work this stuff by the Stakhanoff system too? . . .

* * *

Persistent rumors keep reaching our department that Prime Minister Chamberlain is bargaining with the chief gangsters of Europe—Hitler and Mussolini—whereby England should be permitted to machine-gun the Hindus and the Arabs and for this little privilege the others can freely go about exterminating the Spaniards, Ethiopians—with a few other peoples thrown in for good measure.

This is no surprise to us. Haven't you ever heard of a "gentlemen's agreement" among gangsters whereby one gang is not to encroach on the other's territory? . . .

* * *

At any rate, if you want a True Confession story, subscribe to Stalin's literary magazine Borsht. If you can digest that you won't need Mussolini's castor oil. . . .

* * *

And Franco still is victorious.

Sad as it is to admit, this department never doubted for one moment that our world is ruled by blood and sword.

And now it's Austria trampled under foot by a vicious monster.

The pity of it all is that a herd of humanity isn't far apart from a flock of sheep. The only difference is that sheep cry Baa—and humans hollar Heil— . . .

A special bulletin reached our department that a Chinaman was killed somewhere in an "incident" between China and Japan. . . .

* * *

People are so funny: they ask the Pope he should plead with Franco to stop murdering women and children in Spain.

Don't they know His Holiness has a standing order with Franco to deliver a few million Spanish souls for his Kingdom of Heaven? . . .

* * *

As to the many suicides of intellectuals in Vienna, our only comment is that where soldiers' boots march in there is no room left for culture.

* * *

No, we do not mourn over the death of Clarence Darrow. In fact, we even envy him. In thewords of our Santa-Panta:

As the world looks today
It fits but for pigs anyway. . . .

Santa-Panta

THE MATERIAL NEEDS OF "MAN!"

As late as the second week of this month it looked as though there wouldn't be any April issue. Only a last minute effort by our comrades of the Los Angeles Group prevented this from happening. The issue appears, but with a great deficit. What is urgently needed to assure the regular appearance of MAN! is that more affairs should be arranged by the Groups as also that our individual readers should pay up their subscriptions due, or emulate the excellent example of our friend Wendell Bull who recently contributed his full week's salary.

* * *

The fund toward making possible the appearance of the pamphlet "Defenders of Freedom of Thought Throughout the Ages" has not been what was expected. Only four dollars came in within the last two months. And to publish the pamphlet we need yet about $170.00. No sufficiently strong moral protest can be raised against the persecution of MAN! and of its editor without such a pamphlet as would acquaint a wide circle of people with the facts and ideas involved. Will not some Groups take the initiative for arranging affairs that would aid us in having this pamphlet published?

* * *

We owe an apology to the Gruppo Berneri and Circolo Volonta of New York. They arranged a big affair for the victims of fascism in Spain for April 10, 1938 at Manhattan Plaza. Their announcement reached us alright, but got lost with the linotype man. We didn't realize this until it was already too late to do anything about it, as the March issue was already printed. We hope that the comrades will understand the difficulties under which we carry on the work, and how deeply we regret this omission.

MAN!

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

INCOME: Gruppo C. Berneri, N. Y.—$15.00; Chicago Group—$12.00; Los Angeles Group—$10.75, special donation —$5.00, and $3.88, additional income from previous affair—total $19.63; Pittsburgh, Pa., Group—$5.00; T. Boggiatto—$5.00; J. Briganti—$3.00; Radical Library—$2.00; P. Boggiatto—$2.00; F. Scotto—$2.00; Mike Bisceglia—$2.00. Vincent Di Leo—$2.00; J. Tatty—$1.50; J. Freedman—$1.00; J. Zarden —$1.00; Celia Goldberg—$2.00; Hindustan Newspaper—$1.00; Michael Fierro— $1.00; Atteo Bruzio—$1.00; A. R. Hennacy —$1.00; J. Scarceriaux—$1.00; H. Foucher—.50; Newspapers —.25; Receipt No. 234, 236 237—$1.00 each; Receipt No. 235—$1.10. TOTAL: $87.23.

EXPENDITURES	$113.31
Deficit from previous issue	38.98
	$152.29
INCOME	87.23
DEFICIT	$65.06